Docket No.: 60468.300901 Patent

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the comments in the Advisory Action. It is our understanding that claims 1-26 remain pending in this application.

Applicant respectfully asks the Examiner to reconsider the remarks in Applicant's Response dated 01/08/2008 (in reply to the Action dated 11/09/2007). In addition, Applicant requests consideration of the following new remarks in reply to the Examiner's comments in the Advisory Action dated 01/22/2008.

The Advisory Action states:

5

10

15

20

25

30

35

Applicant asserts "As per claim 1, Le Berre does not teach or reasonably suggest anything about hyperlinks having human and machine interpretable elements" (Remarks: Page 2, Item 3). Examiner respectfully disagrees because (a) Le Berre teaches an activation of the hyperlink (Le Berre: Column 7 Line 28 - 27 and Column 5 Line 56 - 58: an activation of the URL link) and (b) Applicant is respectfully requested to point put exactly which claim limitation corresponding the alleged argument is not taught by Le Berre in order to provide a responsive argument.

Very well, with regard to (a), in retrospect we should have more completely stated 'Le Berre does not teach or reasonably suggest anything about hyperlinks having human and machine interpretable elements and using the human and machine interpretable elements.' As is well known, a spoofed hyperlink has a humanly interpretable element that deliberately (maliciously) does not match its machine interpretable element. For example, a human may see and interpret a hyperlink as indicating that the hyperlink leads to Bank ABC's website, but the underlying machine interpretable hyperlink element actually leads to criminal XYZ's website.

Applicant's point is that Le Berre teaches nothing beyond human recognition of a hyperlink as simply being a hyperlink, so that the hyperlink can then be machine activated. Human recognition is not equivalent to human interpretation, especially not in the present context of spoofing where it is actually (maliciously induced) human miss-interpretation that is relevant.

And with regard to (b), with under-lineations added below for emphasis, claim 1 recites:

A computer program, embodied on a computer readable storage medium, for assisting a user to determine whether <u>a hyperlink to a target uniform resource locator (URL) is spoofed</u>, comprising:

a code segment that listens with a computerized system for an <u>activation of</u> the hyperlink;

Docket No.: 60468.300901 Patent

a code segment that extracts an originator identifier and encrypted data from the hyperlink; ...

Claim 1 clearly recites that <u>spoofing</u> is the problem it solves, and then goes on to recite elements/limitations that solve that problem. In contrast, None of the references cited by the Office (Le Barre, Schneider, etc.) even purport to teach how to solve the problem of spoofing.

The Advisory Action further states:

5

10

Applicant asserts "while the Examiner has only discussed a hash value as encrypted data here with respect to claim 1, the rejection at issue includes claims 6-8, 15-17, and 23-24 and all of these recite language that very clearly make it impossible for Applicant's encrypted data to merely be an encrypted hash value" (Remarks: Page 3 14th Para). Examiner notes Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and are persuasive and as such claims 7, 16 and 24 are rendered as objected instead of rejected subject matters.

We thank the Examiner for this indication of allowable subject matter but we respectfully maintain, for the reasons of record and as further discussed above, that all of the claims in this case should be allowed.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has endeavored to put this case into complete condition for allowance. It is thought that the §103 rejections have been completely rebutted. Applicant therefore asks that all rejections now be withdrawn and that allowance of all claims presently in the case be granted.

Patent Venture Group 10788 Civic Center Drive, Suite 215 Rancho Cucamonga, California 91730-3805 Respectfully Submitted,

A SE Roberts

Telephone: (909) 758-5145 Facsimile: (888) 847-2501 Raymond E. Roberts Reg. No.: 38,597